

if considered necessary, explanatory remarks on language. Damsteegt's detailed sentence-by-sentence analysis, if asking for a fair amount of stamina and concentration on the reader's part, is a painstaking labour of love which brings to light many nuances, hidden layers and implicit or explicit intentions of the text, all the while depicting a remarkable subtlety and insight into both language and narrative strategies.

The textual analysis is supplemented by a helpful glossary of narratological terms and a Hindi-English glossary of the words found in the novel. The omission of words such as *ghuṭnā*, *gāyab*, *kuām*, *oḥhal* is a minor flaw in this otherwise excellent glossary which, on account of the many Sanskrit words in the text, will be much appreciated by those not familiar with the more sanskritized style of Hindi. A final remark on language: in his introduction Damsteegt quotes Kiśor with a statement made during an interview to the effect that in *Yātrāem* he 'had to move quite a way towards *tatsama* words', i.e. Sanskrit loan words, because he felt that he 'could not have communicated that whole emotional area, that whole *experience* through any other vocabulary'. Although not coming as a surprise to those familiar with Hindi literature, this conscious adaptation of a higher speech register to render emotional experiences is a very intriguing phenomenon which would have deserved some further comment.

Damsteegt's book is a unique and pioneering study and an outstanding contribution to the still neglected area of literary analysis of Hindi works. While students of Hindi may feel somewhat overawed by this book, it will provide stimulating reading to advanced readers and scholars. For those teaching Hindi literature, it should be most interesting to try out Damsteegt's analysis in class.

Ulrike Stark

ANDREAS SCHWORCK, *Ursachen und Konturen eines Hindu-Fundamentalismus in Indien aus modernisierungstheoretischer Sicht*. Berlin: VWB - Verlag für Wissenschaft und Bildung, 1997. 273 pages, DM 46,-. ISBN 3-86135-053-X

India has changed its face during the last two decades. Only five years after the shock of Ayodhya has the Hindutva movement become one of the dominant cultural and political forces in the country.

But there is still confusion in journalistic and academic circles about what Hindutva is: fundamentalism, nationalism or even a sort of fascism? With his study *Ursachen und Konturen eines Hindu-Fundamentalismus aus modernisierungstheoretischer Sicht* Andreas Schworck presents the thesis that Hindutva is a kind of fundamentalism and tries to clarify this concept for further studies.

Many authors claim that fundamentalism needs a fundament in terms of a holy book or a religious founder, and that therefore fundamentalism is impossible in Hinduism. Against this argument Schworck defines fundamentalism as a world-wide protest movement which is directed against the political core of modernity, namely human rights, democracy and plurality - and hence possible in all of the world's great religions. Even although it is rooted in native culture, fundamentalism is to be understood not as a traditional movement but as a result of modernisation.

In consequence Schworck develops an analytical framework on the basis of a critical revision of modernisation theories. He understands modernisation as the process of change in transitional societies and restricts his analysis of the connection between modernisation and fundamentalism to social and political mobilisation. Main qualities of fundamentalism are thus explained in terms of modernisation: on the one hand the reconstruction of tradition as an attempt to cope with uprooting following urbanisation, mass communication etc., on the other hand the jeopardizing of democratic and secular institutions as a consequence of expanding political participation which results in the inflation of claims towards unprepared institutions.

Apart from this general background to the rise of Hindutva Schworck names concrete internal and external causes. First of all: the economic liberalisation started in 1991 which he believes drives the urban middle classes into the arms of Hindutva since it provides them - faced by the threat of social decline caused by job cutting in the public sector - with an adequate ideology to defend their interests against the effects of globalisation. He adds the shock of the "cultural invasion" by new foreign mass media. Second: the decay of the legitimacy of the secular institutions caused by corruption and unkept promises under Congress rule. Third: competing fundamentalisms, namely the petrodollar-sponsored Islamism, the terroristic Sikh separatism and other militant movements. Fourth: the newly developed security demands following the demise of India's main ally, the USSR, which now strengthens fears that the Indian Muslims are puppets of the „foreign hand“. Fifth: the radicalisation of the Islamic movements in neighboring Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Unfortunately, the analysis of the Hindutva movement itself - its ideology and organisations - is rather superficial. Although Schworck shows that political thinking in India in many ways differs from its Western equivalent, his fundamentalism concept turns out to be vague. Despite denying in his theoretical considerations that the concept of nationalism is adequate to analyse Hindutva, he speaks of it as Hindu *nationalism*. This problem continues when he gives a profile of the main organisations propagating Hindutva. The Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and the regional party Shiv Sena are characterised as the main agents of Hindu fundamentalism, while their aim is identified as the establishment of a national cultural identity. Schworck does not assign the fundamentalistic label to the Bharatiya Janata Party, although he spots an inner-party wing with close contacts to the fundamentalistic firebrands. As for the activists and voters, the urban middle classes are named as well as the neo-urban poor classes - but empirical evidence is missing.

Sworck concludes his study about fundamentalism in India with a comparison with Islamic fundamentalism. He maintains that in contrast to Islamism, the Hindutva movement is a quite coherent movement. Although both movements are considered to share anti-Western attitudes, the main enemies of Hindutva are the Indian Muslims; therefore Schworck describes Hindutva as a domestic fundamentalism. He states that it is not primarily an expression of anti-modernisation but above all an attempt to make good a nation-building which failed under the pattern preached by the Congress. For that reason he is more worried about the future integrity and stability of India than about a forthcoming clash of civilisations.

The strength of Schworck's study is to explain the rise of Hindutva as a function of modernisation and to point out further concrete causes, but once more it shows the dilemma of the fundamentalism paradigm. To be sure, aggressive political movements can arise in pluralistic religions like Hinduism and their similarities with movements from other cultural backgrounds are obvious, but do their anti-Western attitudes qualify them as fundamentalistic? The main aim of Hindutva is to create a Hindu nation, and even Schworck states this fact. To name it a domestic fundamentalism is not convincing. One should remember that the opposition against full-scale modernisation is as old as modernisation itself and that European nationalisms of the late 19th century are full of such ideological antipathy. By insisting on his concept Schworck missed the chance to present a study about the characteristics of nation-building in a Third World country and its characteristics which would have provided a better cross-cultural perspective.

Eric Töpfer

JAKOB RÖSEL, *Die Gestalt und Entstehung des Tamilischen Nationalismus*. (Ordo Politicus, 31). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1997. 277 pages, DM 98,-. ISBN 3-428-08849-2

This book deals with ideology and politics in southern India and northern Sri Lanka. It begins with the Dravidian movement in the Madras Presidency in the early 20th century, which led to the foundation of a regional party, from which the two contemporary major parties of Tamil Nadu - the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) and the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (AIADMK) - originate. These parties have ruled in Tamil Nadu since 1967 and play a decisive role in the national arena at present. In addition, two chapters are dedicated to the emergence of Tamil nationalism in Sri Lanka. The foundation of this regional identity is of crucial importance for the analysis of the present conflict. However, the contemporary politics of Tamil separatism in Sri Lanka is the topic of a separate publication by the same author (see review in this issue). Rösel's work integrates these two developments in India and Sri Lanka into one analytical framework, and thus provides valuable insights into the political history of India and Sri Lanka. The flow of the text follows the chronology of events and the well-founded analysis is embedded primarily in the regional context. A reader interested in political theory will find an excellent case study of great depth and range but should not expect much discussion of nationalism in general.

The first seven chapters deal with south India: In a brief and sophisticated introduction into its cultural history the emergence of the Dravidian movement is described. Rösel's point of departure is the interaction of a north Indian Brahmanic tradition with a local culture which led to a synthesis in its own right. Inspired by the linguistic works of Robert Caldwell in the mid-19th century, who described Tamil culture as an independent autochthonous tradition, a political movement emerged which was basically anti-Brahmin and (therefore?!) pro-British. The Dravidian Justice Party (JP) challenged the Congress Party and won the 1916 elections, but soon lost influence. Rösel rightly concludes that opposition to a political, economic and